

May 24, 2006 amendment. Thus, new claims 57-72 are in immediate condition for allowance for the same reasons as claims 6-8 and 14-18.

The Office Action dated March 31, 2005 stated that claims 21-24 were allowed. Accordingly, applicants rewrote claims 21-24 as new claims 73-76 in the May 24, 2006 amendment. Thus, new claims 73-76 are in immediate condition for allowance for the same reasons as claims 21-24.

All search and examination work necessary to allow the pending claims has apparently been completed. In view of the prosecution history, the requirement at this stage appears to be incorrect.

(2) All of the embodiments describe a mirror comprising a reflective surface, a non-reflective portion provided within the reflective surface as an information provider and a display backing a transparent portion of the mirror. This single inventive concept informs all of the claims. Species II (claims 59, 60 and 74) include at least one loudspeaker connected to the display. The other species are just differently expressed aspects of the same invention. Species VIII includes at least one loudspeaker connected to an input device rather than the display. Species VI and VII add a radio receiver and the ability to control volume to this system. Species V associates the loudspeaker with a perforated region of a frame. Similarly, Species III and IV depict a different frame and how the display is secured to the frame. Species I states that the display comprises a hologram. Is it respectfully submitted that the pending claims are not directed to patentably independent and distinct inventions.


(3) The Action states that the species “are independent or distinct because they have a different design, mode of operation, and/or function.” However, the Action fails to explain how and why each of the inventions of the identified species is separately classified for search. The Action does not contend that searching multiple species together would impose an undue search burden. Applicant respectfully submits that each of the inventions of the identified species is not separately classified for search, and searching multiple species together would not impose an undue search burden.

Applicant's election is made without prejudice. Early favorable action withdrawing the election of species requirement and allowing the claims in this application is solicited.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 606682000100.

Dated: September 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Alex Chartove

Registration No.: 31,942
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7744